

## REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that Claims 1-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over the U.S. patent to Shafer in view of the U.S. patents to Maesoba and Oohashi.

Also, the claims are rejected under 35 USC 112.

After carefully considering the Examiner's grounds for rejection of the claims, applicants first of all amended the claims in compliance with the Examiner's requirements in his rejection of the claims as being indefinite.

The wire elements have been consistently identified as "stamped wire elements." The circumferential direction has been defined as transverse to a longitudinal direction of the wire elements, thus making it definite. The radial directions therefore can be derived from the circumferential direction as extending radially relative to the circumference. As for the term "star point", it is believed to be clear that since an inventor and a patent attorney can be their only lexicographers, this term should be considered as acceptable.

It is therefore believed that the Examiner's grounds for rejection of the claims under 35 USC 112 should be considered as not tenable and should be withdrawn.

After carefully considering the Examiner's grounds for rejection of the claims over the art, applicants amended Claim 1 by incorporating into it the features of Claim 9, and also amended Claim 13 by introducing into it the features of Claim 1.

Claims 1 and 13, the broadest independent claims, define the features which clearly and patentably distinguish the present invention from the prior art applied by the Examiner.

Claim 1, the first broadest independent claim on file, defines that the wire ends are bent radially inwardly with their ends, and then the radially inwardly formed winding head composed of the wire windings is connected with a connecting ring 40.

The references applied by the Examiner have been carefully considered. The patents to Shafer, Maesoba and Oohashi do not teach these new features of the present invention. They also do not teach these features of the present invention combined with the feature, that on an

interconnection point end of the winding, an automatic contacting of the start point by corresponding means is provided.

The features of Claim 1 in their combination, in particular the features specified hereinabove, are not disclosed in the references.

The features of Claim 13 which include the above-mentioned features of Claim 1 and the three start point wires facing one another with bent ends lying on the inside of the winding head and connected with the connecting ring are also not disclosed in the above discussed references.

The Examiner rejected the claims over patents to Shafer, Maesoba and Oohashi in their combination under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious. It is clear that the references do not disclose the new features of the present invention as defined in Claim 1 and 13, and the references do not contain any hint or suggestion for such features. In order to arrive at the present invention from the references, taken singly or in their combination, the references have to be fundamentally modified by including into them the new features of the present invention as defined in Claims 1 and 13 which were first proposed by the applicants. However, it is known that in order to arrive at a claimed invention, by modifying the references the cited art must itself contain a suggestion for such a modification.

This principle has been consistently upheld by the U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals which, for example, held in its decision In Re Randol and Redford (165 USPQ 586) that:

Prior patents are references only for what they clearly disclose or suggest, it is not a proper use of a patent as a reference to modify its structure to one which prior art references do not suggest.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 1 and 13 should be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should be allowed.

As for the dependent claims, these claims depend on Claim 1, they share its allowable features, and therefore they should be allowed as well.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be

carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 27233